



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,663	12/26/2001	Iosif Korsunsky		7938

25859 7590 11/28/2003
WEI TE CHUNG
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/033663

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Title "With Replaceable Component" should be added.

Abstract, use of "replaceable component, such as magnetic coil should be added.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Minich.

Minich system includes housing 1, module 8, 9, with tails 11, 12 and component 4 upper contact 6 and lower contact 5.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minich in view of Loudermilk.

Minich
Inductor is equivalent to a coil. Minich does not disclose use of middle contacts. Such contact use is shown by Loudermilk at 201. Obvious to so form the Minich pcb 4 to enable the inductor (coil) to be fixed to the pcb. This would only be a standard practice. In such arrangement, Minich could be formed as a "single" jack like that of Loudermilk (only one module 8, 9.)

Art Unit: 2839

Claim ³ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minich in view of Lu.

Minich tails 21 are not fork shaped. Lu shows (fig. 2) terminals with fork shaped ends 24, 34. It would have been obvious to use such terminals on the Minich modules 8, 9 to receive component pins. This would allow for easy removableness of the component.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheer alone or taken in view of Hollyday, Fuerst and Loudermilk.

The Scheer, figs. 5, 6 system includes insulative housing 22, terminal modules 16 and component 42, 10, 12a, 48 (fig. 7). The component upper contacts for mating with module 16 tails is not clearly shown, however it is standard to use vias or plated holes, read as contacts for such purpose. It would have been obvious to use such vias or plated holes in the Scheer system to enable connection to the pin tails. Should above be at issue, also note Fuerst plated holes 21, Loudermilk and Hollyday vias T1, B1 contacts 116. Obvious to use any of these types in Scheer pcb for joining the component to the contact tails. Also while terminal modules are shown by Scheer, should these be at issue, also obvious to use such modules as more clearly shown by Loudermilk at 120.

Claims 2, 3, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheer in view of Loudermilk, Hollyday and Fuerst.

Scheer does not disclose use of fork-shaped contacts. Fuerst uses fork shaped contacts. For claim 2, Hollyday at 116 also shows contact use. It would have been obvious to form the Scheer pcb with contacts as per Hollyday, but formed as forks as in Fuerst. For claim 3, it also

Art Unit: 2839


would have been obvious to form the Scheer modules 16 with fork type contacts tails for engaging pcb pins in view of Fuerst. Such type engagement provides for easy insertion and removableness.

For claim 4, Scheer fig 5 includes a main base (pcb) 42 with upper contacts (top set 16), lower contacts 18 and coils 12a, 48 assembled to middle contacts (holes) on the pcb. This is adequate for claim 4. In addition, obvious to use a pcb/coil arrangement like that of Loudemilk at 200 which more clearly shows upper, middle and lower contacts (vias) and a coil fixed to the pcb. Reference to a base does not overcome Scheer pcb 42. If the pcb alone is adequate, addition of a schematically disclosed base that produces no advantage over use of the pcb alone should not overcome the Scheer/Loudermilk combination. Claim 5, for Scheer, note use of two modules 16, 16. Reference to "two components" does not unobviously overcome Scheer disclosure of pcb 42 since such change seems to provide greater complexity over, use of a single component but not to provide any stated new result. Such change considered obvious variation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

N ABRAMS/pj

11/24/03


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322